Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/803,726	QUENZI, PHILIP J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LEE D. WILSON	3723

All Participants:

(1) *LEE D. WILSON*.

(2) *Karl T. Ondersma*.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *13 September 2006*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
All rejections of record

Claims discussed:
All art of record

Prior art documents discussed:
US-3,942,249 and all other art of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
*See Continuation Sheet*

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

LEE D. WILSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant contacted the examiner to present arguments where the invention reads over the prior art because the rotational and cam member rotate and lock the blade where as the prior art has a lock that abuts the blade. The application is in conditions for allowance and the record is complete and there is no need for the applicant to submit a summary of the interview because the record is complete.

LEE D. WILSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER